A discovery in the history of research on Japanese kana orthography: Ishizuka Tatsumaro's Kanazukai oku no yamamichi

A Discovery in the History of Research on Japanese *Kana* Orthography:

Ishizuka Tatsumaro's *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*

HASHIMOTO Shinkichi

1   Two Aspects of *Kana* Orthography Research

Kana orthography refers to the way of using *kana* [i.e., Chinese characters used to write Japanese syllables phonographically, including both the unabbreviated characters (*man'yōgana*), used mostly in the Nara period (710–794) and early in the Heian Period (794–1185), and the abbreviated forms (*hiragana* and *katakana*) that first appeared around 900]. When it comes to using あ to represent the sound "a" or か to represent the sound "ka," things are clear and simple, and no doubts arise. It is only when two or more different letters correspond to the same sound, as in the case of い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*] [both pronounced *i* today] or お [*o*] and を [*wo*] [both pronounced *o* today], that doubts arise as to which letter to use. Thus, we can say that problems of *kana* orthography are actually just problems of choosing which letter to use.

Kana orthography problems have two aspects. On the one hand, there is the question of whether or not letters that represent the same sound (い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*] [for *i*], お [*o*] and を [*wo*] [for *o*], etc.) should be distinguished, and if so, which letter should be used when. On the other hand, there is the question of whether these alternative letters actually are distinguished in writing, and if they are, which letter is used when. In other words, the first is a question of principle, and the second is a question of actual fact. The former is a prescriptive matter, whereas the latter is a descriptive matter. What are called *kana* orthography problems in everyday life are almost always in the prescriptive category, and pronunciation-based *kana* orthography, historical *kana* orthography, and theoretical *kana* orthography are all labels for principles of *kana* orthography.

For the most part, the matters that scholars debated in the past were also prescriptive questions. However, this does not mean that there has been a dearth of research on the other aspect of *kana* orthography, that is, descriptive research. Keichū [1640–1701], the first advocate of historical *kana* orthography, discovered that, in documents from the early Heian period and before, *man'yōgana* corresponding to *hiragana* い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*] [both pronounced *i* today], え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*] [both pronounced *e* today], お [*o*] and を [*wo*] [both pronounced *o* today], and so on, were strictly distinguished, and he argued that all *kana* orthography should respect the usage in examples from this period. Keichū's principles of *kana* orthography were based on the results of his research on *kana* usage in ancient times. Most later scholars followed the principles of historical *kana* orthography that Keichū had advocated, and because this standard *kana* orthography depended on ancient texts, research on ancient *kana* usage gradually gained momentum.

This later research not only revised and expanded Keichū's work, using additional sources, it also led to the discovery of facts that were previously unknown.

Phonograms in ancient texts are the core data for research on the phonological system of ancient times. To infer which sounds people at that time pronounced and heard differently, one looks at how phonograms were used in contemporary texts, which means that research on ancient *kana* orthography is the indispensable foundation for phonological research. Thus, research on *kana* orthography in ancient texts is significant not only in its own right but also because of its enormous impact on research into Japanese historical phonology, making it one of the most important topics in Japanese language studies. Nonetheless, in published work on Japanese language studies, *kana* orthography has been taken to mean only prescriptive problems, and this other important aspect seems to have been forgotten. It is extremely unfortunate that nothing is available to elucidate the legacy of research on this other aspect of *kana* orthography.

I will not attempt here to narrate the history of research on this other aspect. I would simply like to discuss three of the most notable works, each of which reports the discovery of features of *kana* usage in ancient texts and is a major contribution to research on Japanese historical phonology. The three works are *Waji shōranshō* [1695] by Keichū, *Kogen e'enben* [1829] by Okumura Teruzane [1792–1843], and *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* [see §2 below] by Ishizuka Tatsumaro [see §2 below]. *Waji shōranshō* was the first work to demonstrate that in *Wamyōshō* [early 10th c.] and earlier texts distinctions were maintained between いえお [for *i e o*] and ゐゑを [for *wi we wo*], between じず [for *zi zu*] and ぢづ [for *di du*], and between letters such as は and わ not only in word-initial position [where they represent *ha* and *wa* today] but also in non-word-initial position [where both represent *wa* today]. *Kogen e'enben* showed clearly that in *Shinsen jikyō* [ca. 900] and earlier texts the different letters corresponding to present-day え (for "e") were kept separate. *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* showed that for each of many present-day sounds ("e," "ki," "ke," "ko," and several others) Nara period texts used two different sets of letters and that, in each case, the letters in one set were not interchangeable with the letters in the other set.

Waji shōranshō does not require any special explanation here because bibliographical notes, commentaries, and critiques have already been published. As for *Kogen e'enben*, not even the title appears in works on history of Japanese language studies; all we have is meagre commentary in annotated bibliographies and in catalogs of books on Japanese language studies. But Takahashi Tomie [1825–1914] has published a revised version, and more recently Ōya Tōru [1851–1928] reinvestigated the actual examples in the old texts and published an expanded version in which he demonstrates that what Okumura said in *Kogen e'enben* is correct. Thus, scholars have finally come to recognize its value.

When it comes to *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, however, which reveals previously unnoticed spelling distinctions in Nara period texts and is no less important than *Waji shōranshō*, researchers have so far failed to see its true value, and the commentaries in histories of Japanese language studies and in bibliographical notes have all missed the

point. I myself have been fortunate enough to grasp its true nature and to become convinced of its significance in the history of research on *kana* orthography. This article discusses the research reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*.

2   The Research Reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*

Kanazukai oku no yamamichi, a three-volume work that has come down to us in handwritten copies, was written by Ishizuka Tatsumaro (1764–1823). Ishizuka was a follower of Motoori Norinaga [1730–1801], and he also wrote *Kogen seidakukō* [1801]. The completion date of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* is uncertain, but the preface by Inagake Ōhira [1756–1833] is dated 1798, so we can be sure that it was earlier than that. The main text is preceded by an introduction and a chart of *man'yōgana* [i.e., unabbreviated Chinese characters used as syllabic phonograms] entitled "*Kana* in the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*." This chart shows all the Chinese-character phonograms that were used in each of these three texts, arranged in modern [i.e., *a-i-u-e-o*] order. The main text shows which of these *man'yōgana* were used for the sounds corresponding to each modern *kana* letter and is thus divided into sections, one for あ ("a"), one for い ("i"), one for う ("u"), and so on. Within each section, words that contain that sound are listed by citing actual examples from the ancient texts to show which *man'yōgana* were used for that sound. The first volume covers あいうえお [*a i u e o*] and かきくけこ [*ka/ga ki/gi ku/gu ke/ge ko/go*]. The second volume covers さしすせそ [*sa/za si/zi su/zu se/ze so/zo*], たちつてと [*ta/da ti/di tu/du te/de to/do*], なにぬねの [*na ni nu ne no*], and はひふへほ [*ha/ba hi/bi hu/bu he/be ho/bo*]. The third volume covers まみむめも [*ma mi mu me mo*], やゆよ [*ya yu yo*], らりるれろ [*ra ri ru re ro*], and わゐゑを [*wa wi we wo*].

Unlike ordinary books on *kana* orthography, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* does not discuss how いゐえゑおを [*i wi e we o wo*] and so on should be used. Instead, it investigates the rules governing *kana* in Nara period texts such as the *Kojiki* [712], *Nihongi* [720], and *Man'yōshū* [late 8th c.], as the following quotation from the introduction makes clear.

In ancient times, the *man'yōgana* that could be used for a particular sound were strictly determined by the word being written, but by the end of the Nara period these distinctions appear to have been breaking down, and nothing has been written about the texts other than the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū* that should be used as evidence. Although it is not clear why these rules were observed, they are an enormous help in interpreting ancient Japanese. Our master [Motoori Norinaga] was the first to appreciate this fact, and in his *Kojikiden* he took generations of earlier scholars to task for failing to realize it. Following his lead, I will explain these rules in detail.

However, Ishizuka does not provide a sufficient explanation of the nature of these *man'yōgana* spelling rules, and his introduction does not clarify the matter. Nor does one get a clear understanding by reading the explanation in *Kojikiden* [1790–1822], which he cited as the basis for his research. (The full text of the *Kojikiden* explanation will be

presented below.) Consequently, all we can do to ascertain the nature of the rules is to closely scrutinize the content of Ishizuka's work.

Looking first at the *man'yōgana* chart at the beginning of the book, the several different characters that represent each sound are grouped together. Some groups consist of a single list followed by the notation "all equivalent," but other groups are divided into two subsets, with each subset list followed by the notation "equivalent." For example, the い [*i*] group and the う [*u*] group are single lists:

い [*i*]　　*Kojiki*: 伊　*Nihongi*: 伊以異易怡壹　*Man'yōshū*: 移以異已壹伊　all

　　　　equivalent

う [*u*]　　*Kojiki*: 宇汙　*Nihongi*: 宇汙�于禹羽　*Man'yōshū*: 宇汙于烏有雲羽　all

　　　　equivalent

The え [*e*] group and the よ [*yo*] group, on the other hand, contain two subsets:

え [*e*]　　*Kojiki*: 延; 愛　*Nihongi*: 愛哀埃 equivalent; 延曳叡 equivalent　*Man'yōshū*:

　　　　衣依愛 equivalent; 延要叡曳 equivalent

よ [*yo*]　*Kojiki*: 余與豫 equivalent; 用　*Nihongi*: 與豫預余譽 equivalent; 用庸

　　　　equivalent　*Man'yōshū*: 余餘與譽 equivalent; 用欲容 equivalent

For paired sounds, one beginning with a voiceless consonant and the other beginning with a voiced consonant, in some cases there is just a voiceless subset and a voiced subset, but in other cases there are two voiceless subsets and two voiced subsets. For example, for the **か** [*ka*] group has just two subsets (voiceless and voiced):

か [*ka*]　*Kojiki*: 甲訶迦加可; voiced [*ga*] 賀我何　*Nihongi*: 加伽迦箇介訶軻柯舸哿可

　　　　河歌甲; voiced [*ga*] 餓俄峨鵝我　*Man'yōshū*: 加迦嘉可哥箇香甲; voiced

　　　　[*ga*] 何河我賀　all equivalent

The き [*ki*] group, on the other hand, has two voiceless subsets and two voiced subsets:

き [*ki*]　*Kojiki*: 伎岐吉棄 equivalent; 紀幾貴 equivalent; voiced [*gi*] 岐藝 equivalent;

　　　　疑　*Nihongi*: 枳企耆祇吉己棄伎支岐既 equivalent; 氣基幾機紀奇

equivalent; voiced [*gi*] 疑擬 equivalent; 藝儀蟻 equivalent   *Man'yōshū*: 吉

伎企枳棄忌支 equivalent; 紀奇寄綺騎貴 equivalent; voiced [*gi*] 疑宜義

equivalent; 藝祇 equivalent

Every modern *kana* falls into one or the other of these two types, and according to
Ishizuka's introduction:

> The notation "equivalent" means that the listed *man'yōgana* are interchangeable. To
> give an example, the first syllable of *kinohu* ['yesterday'] is sometimes written with 伎, but
> 伎 is not the only possibility; it could also be written with 吉, 枳, etc.

Also in the introduction:

> In the *Kojiki* only 古 was used to write the *ko* of *ko* ['child'], *ko* ['small'], *wotoko* ['man'], and *hiko*
> ['boy'], but in the *Nihongi* a wide range of characters was used, including 古, 姑, 故, 固, 枯, 胡, 孤,
> and 雇. (All of these others could be used instead of 古. But none of 許, 己, 擧, 據, 居, 虛, 去, 莒, etc.
> was ever used for these words, although 許 and the rest could be used instead of each other to
> write *ko*. In the *Kojiki* 古 and 許 were clearly distinguished.) Likewise, 祁, 鷄, 稽, 家, 啓, 虛, 去, 莒,
> etc., were used to write the past-tense ending *ke*. (Any of the others could be used instead of 祁.
> Only 祁 was used in the *Kojiki*.) But none of 氣, 開, 慨, 階, 戒, 凱, 居, etc. (which were
> interchangeable) was used for this word.

These passages clearly mean that the *man'yōgana* in each subset could be substituted for
each other. For a modern *kana* of Type 1, there is just a single set [as in the *i* and *u* lists
above] or just a voiceless set and a voiced set [as in the *ka* list above]. There was no
distinction whatever among the *man'yōgana* in a given set; any one could be chosen. In
contrast, for a modern *kana* of Type 2, there are two subsets [as in the *e* and *yo* lists above]
or two voiceless subsets and two voiced subsets [as in the *ki* list above]. The *man'yōgana*
within a subset could be substituted for each other, but those in one subset could not
replace those in another subset. In other words, there were clear-cut distinctions between

the subsets. Of the modern *kana*, 32 are Type 1: あ[*a*] い[*i*] う[*u*] お[*o*] か[*ka*] く[*ku*] さ[*sa*] し

[*si*] す[*su*] せ[*se*] た[*ta*] つ[*tu*] て[*te*] な[*na*] に[*ni*] ね[*ne*] の[*no*] は[*ha*] ふ[*hu*] ほ[*ho*] ま[*ma*] む

[*mu*] や[*ya*] ゆ[*yu*] ら[*ra*] り[*ri*] る[*ru*] れ[*re*] わ[*wa*] ゐ[*wi*] ゑ[*we*] を [*wo*]. And 13 are Type 2:

え[*e*] き[*ki*] け[*ke*] こ[*ko*] そ[*so*] と[*to*] ぬ[*nu*] ひ[*hi*] へ[*he*] み[*mi*] め[*me*] よ[*yo*] ろ[*ro*]. As for

ち[*ti*] and も[*mo*], they are Type 2 in the *Kojiki*, with distinct subsets, but the subsets are

intermingled in the *Nihongi* and *Man'yōshū*.*

These are the *man'yōgana* distinctions presented in the chart at the beginning of Ishizuka's book. We see the difference between Type 1 and Type 2 in the main text as well. For some Type 1 *kana*, Ishizuka did not cite any words at all, explaining that "Since there are no restrictions on use, I do not give examples." For other Type 1 *kana*, he simply illustrated with restrictions on use in particular vocabulary items such as the names of people, places, or gods (e.g., only 賀 is used for *ga* in the *iga* that appears in the names of provinces and people). For Type 2 *kana*, on the other hand, he gave separate lists of examples words for each *man'yōgana* subset.

For example, Ishizuka used 衣 and 延 as labels for the subsets corresponding to modern え [*e*]. Under 衣 he listed *e* ('obtaining'), *e-* [potential prefix], *e* ['audaciously'], *e* ('good'), *kae* (person's name), *ehime* (place name), *emisi* (ethnic name), *eturi* ('reeds'), *mieri* (place name), and *ekurusiwe* ['ah, how trying!']. Under 延 he listed *e* (alternating with *re*), *e* ('inlet'), *e* (alternating with *yo*), *-e* (in endings on verbs that also take endings containing *ya*, *i*, and *yu*), *eda* ('branch'), *ebi* ('sash'), *koe* ('crossing'), *hue* ('flute'), *sae* ('dice'), *nue* ('thrush'), *hukae* (place name), *kuebiko* (god's name), and *yagahae* ('luxuriant growing').

For the subsets corresponding to modern よ [*yo*] Ishizuka used 用 and 余 as labels. Under 用 he listed *yo* ('night'), *yo* (used in place of *yue* 'because of'), *yori* ('from'), *yobu* ('to call'), *ayo* (place name), *mayo* ('eyebrow'), *yotati* ('work assignment'), *kayohu* ('to go repeatedly'), *kiyosi* ('pure'), *mayohu* ('to become confused'), *mayohi* ('unraveling'), *tayora* ('wavering shape'), *sayohime* (person's name), *nayotake* ('pliant bamboo'), *isayohu* ('to hesitate'), *kagayohu* ('to sparkle'), *tadayohu* ('to drift'), *asayohi* ('morning and evening'), *yobukotori* (kind of bird). Under 余 he listed *yo* ('world; era'), *yo* (emphatic particle), *yo* ('joint'), *yoki* ('avoiding'), *yoko* ('side'), *yosi* ('good'), *yosi* ('reason'), *yosi* ('even if'), *yoso* ('elsewhere'), *yoti* ('same-age child'), *yodi* ('pulling'), *yodo* ('backwater'), *yohi* ('evening'), *yomu* ('to count'), *yomi* ('netherworld'), *yoru* ('to approach'), *soyo* (a sound), *toyo* ('abundant'), *iyo* (province name), *hoyo* ('mistletoe'), *yosohu* (person's name), *yosohi* ('getting dressed'), *yosori* ('being attracted'), *yosohe* ('likening'), *yosoga* ('means'), *yosinu* (place name), *yosami* (surname or place name), *yomogi* ('mugwort'), *yoyomu* ('to be inarticulate'), *yorogi* (place name), *yorodu* ('myriad'), *yorosi* ('excellent'), *yorohu* ('to decorate'), *iyoyo* ('more'), *oyosi* ('old person'), *toyomi* ('making noise'), *hitoyo* ('one branch'), *tokoyo* ('perpetuity'), *yosadura* ('gourd'), *yorihime* ('person's name), *oyodure* ('confounding prophecy'), *namayomi* (conventional epithet), *nikoyaka* ('smiling'), *tukuyomi* ('moon'), *hasikiyosi* ('loving').

There are subsets like these for every Type 2 modern *kana* in Ishizuka's book, and each subset is labeled with a representative *man'yōgana*:

Subsets

え [e]　衣　延

き [ki]　紀　伎

           [gi] 疑   藝

け [ke] 祁   氣

こ [ko] 古   許

           [go] 吳   碁

そ [so] 蘇   曾

と [to] 斗   登

           [do] 度   杼

ぬ [nu] 怒   奴

ひ [hi] 斐   比

           [bi] 備   毘

へ [he] 幣   閉

           [be] 辨   倍

み [mi] 微   美

め [me] 賣   米

よ [yo] 用   余

ろ [ro] 漏   呂

ち [ti] 智   知   There was no distinction except in the *Kojiki*.*

も [mo]母   毛   ″

This classification corresponds to the subsets in Ishizuka's *man'yōgana* chart, which lists the *man'yōgana* that belong to each subset. The main text shows which words were written with the characters in each subset.

As already noted above, Ishizuka's book reports his research on rules of *man'yōgana* usage in the ancient texts such as the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*. In most cases the *man'yōgana* corresponding to a single modern sound were interchangeable, but in 18 cases (20 cases in the *Kojiki*) there are two subsets of *man'yōgana*, and while those in the same subset were interchangeable with each other, they were not interchangeable with those in the other subset. Ishizuka's research clearly demonstrates that which subset was used depended on which word was being written.

There are basically two kinds of *man'yōgana* usage rules. One kind requires the use of a particular one of the many *man'yōgana* that correspond to the same modern sound. The other kind does not require one particular *man'yōgana*, but the choice is constrained so that not every letter corresponding to the same modern sound can be used. In other words, the first kind of rule specifies a particular character, while the second kind specifies a range of characters. The rules that apply to specific individual words such as the names of places or people are the first kind, and the rules that require differentiating subsets of *man'yōgana* are the second kind. Thus, in assessing the relationship between these two kinds of rules and phonology, the former simply involve following the customs of earlier times and are not relevant to phonology; they are just arbitrary spelling rules. The latter, however, can generally be attributed to phonological distinctions that existed in the language at that time. Of course, some rules of the former kind might reflect the phonology of an even earlier period, so they cannot simply be ignored, but, needless to say, it is the rules of the latter type that provide truly valuable data for investigating the phonological system of the Nara period.

As for the kinds of rules that are discussed in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, those that apply to the 18 modern sounds for which subsets exist are rules for differentiating two sets of characters corresponding to the same modern sound. In other words, these rules specify the range of interchangeable characters in each case and are purely matters of *kana* orthography. However, Ishizuka also considered sets of characters that could ordinarily be used interchangeably but were restricted when writing particular names of places, people, gods, etc. A particular character had to be used in a particular name, and another character could not be used in its place. Thus, Ishizuka gives rules of both kinds, but most of his book concerns the 18 modern sounds for which there are subsets of *man'yōgana*, and it goes without saying that, for the most part, the rules for these 18 sounds are the focus of our attention.

3   Kanazukai oku no yamamichi and Kojikiden

As Ishizuka states clearly in the introduction to *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, his research was based on the explanation in *Kojikiden*. This explanation appears in a passage reporting Motoori Norinaga's research on *man'yōgana* usage, in the section on *man'yōgana* in volume 1 of *Kojikiden*. The complete text is as follows:

And in many cases the *man'yōgana* that can be used for a given sound are restricted and depend on the word being written. To give an example, both 許 and 古 are frequently used for こ [*ko*], but only 古, never 許, is used to write *ko* 'child'. (The same is true for *ko* in *hiko* 'boy', *wotoko* 'man', etc.) For め [*me*], both 米 and 賣 are frequently used, but only 賣, never 米, is used to write *me* 'woman'. (The same is true for *me* in *hime* 'woman', *wotome* 'maiden', etc.) For き [*ki*], 伎, 岐, and 紀 are frequently used, but only 紀, never 伎 or 岐, is used to write *ki* 'tree' and *ki* 'fort'. For と [*to*], 登, 斗, and 刀 are frequently used, but only 斗 or 刀, never 登, is used to write *to* in *to* 'door', *huto* 'great', and *tohu* 'to ask'. For み [*mi*], 美 and 微 are frequently used, but only 微, never 美, is used to write *mi* in *kami* 'god' and *mi* 'fruit'. For も [*mo*], 毛 and 母 are frequently used, but only 毛, never 母, is used to write *mo* in *imo* 'sister', *momo* 'hundred', *kumo* 'cloud', etc. For ひ [*hi*], 比 and 肥 are frequently used, but only 肥, never 比, is used to write *hi* 'fire'. For ひ [*hi*] in *ohi* 'growing', only 斐, never 比 or 肥, is used. For び [*bi*], 備 and 毘 are used, but only 毘, never 備, is used to write *bi* in -*biko* (< *hiko* 'boy') and -*bime* (< *hime* 'girl'). For け [*ke*], 氣 and 祁 are used, but only 氣, never 祁, is used to write *ke* in *wake* 'governor'. For *ke* in the grammatical ending -*keri* [past tense], only 祁 is used, never 氣. For ぎ [*gi*], 藝 is frequently used, but only 疑, never 藝, is used to write *gi* in *sugi* 'passing' and *negi* 'praying for protection'. For そ [*so*], 曾 and 蘇 are used, but only 蘇, never 曾, is used to write *so* in *sora* 'sky'. For よ [*yo*], 余, 與, and 用 are used, but only 用, never 余 or 與, is used to write *yo* in *yori* 'from'. For ぬ [*nu*], 奴 and 怒 are frequently used, but only 怒, never 奴, is used to write *nu* that later came to be pronounced *no*, as in *nu* 'field', *tunu* 'horn', *sinubu* 'to tolerate', *sinu* 'bamboo grass', and *tanusi* 'pleasant', etc. I have tried here to cite examples that appear repeatedly in the same word in the *Kojiki*. There are many other *man'yōgana* restrictions of the same kind that are faintly apparent not only in the *Kojiki* but also in the *Nihongi*, *Man'yōshū*, etc., but I will not attempt to give them here. They require more careful consideration, but they cannot yet be stated with the same degree of precision as those given above. The restrictions that I have uncovered were previously unknown, and they will undoubtedly be a tremendous help in understanding ancient Japanese.

Ishizuka took this explanation of Motoori's as the point of departure for his own research. While Motoori's research was limited to the *Kojiki*, Ishizuka extended it to a wide range of Nara period texts by thoroughly investigating the *Nihongi*, the *Man'yōshū*, and others. As a result, he did more than simply verify Motoori's explanation; his research led to the discovery of new facts that Motoori had never imagined.

The kind of *man'yōgana* rules that Motoori pointed out in *Kojikiden* were restrictions that applied to particular words: for こ [*ko*], both 許 and 古 are frequently used, but only 古, never 許, is used to write *ko* 'child'; for め [*me*], both 米 and 賣 are frequently used, but only 賣, never 米, is used to write *me* 'woman'; and so on. These restrictions did not apply to all the *man'yōgana* used to write syllables corresponding to modern *ko* and *me*. Ishizuka, however, by investigating a large number of Nara period texts, showed that these rules were not limited to a small number of individual words but applied to every word containing a syllable corresponding to modern *ko*, *me*, etc. The *man'yōgana* in the 古 subset and the 賣 subset were used in different words from those in the 許 subset and the 米

subset, and the subsets were never confused with each other, and this allowed Ishizuka to set up the 18 groups listed above.

Ishizuka's research thus carried Motoori's research forward and cannot be considered entirely original, but the results he obtained were completely new, and he deserves all the credit for discovering these rules of *man'yōgana* orthography. Motoori simply opened the door.

4   Results of the Research Reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*

The three main sources for the research in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* were the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*, but it appears that Ishizuka also referred to range of other works from the *Bussokuseki-ka* [ca. 750], the imperial edicts in the *Shoku-Nihongi* [797], and the *Izumo fudoki* [733] to records of family names, ceremony books, the *Engishiki* [927], the *Kogo shūi* [807], the *Kanke man'yōshū* [ca. 900], the *Wamyōshō*, and the *Taiki bekki* [mid-12th c.], since their titles appear here and there in his book. By investigating these documents, Ishizuka demonstrated that for most of the *man'yōgana* groups corresponding to a single modern sound, the characters were interchangeable, but for each of the 18 groups listed above, there were two subsets of characters that were differentiated in use. Regarding these 18 groups, he wrote in his introduction:

> By the end of the Nara period these distinctions appear to have been breaking down, and nothing
> that should be used as evidence has been written about the texts other than the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and
> *Man'yōshū*.

(He noted, however, that a small number of the quotations in the *Kogen betsuonshō* [see §6 below] can be used as evidence.) In other words, because there are many mistakes in the texts other than the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*, for the most part these others cannot be used as evidence for Nara period *man'yōgana* orthography (although Ishizuka does cite some examples from these other texts, noting that "I have selected examples from later texts that are consistent with those in the three reliable texts"). It is not the case, however, that the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū* are absolutely always correct. Ishizuka also wrote in his introduction that "The usages in the *Kojiki* are almost entirely correct, but there are occasional confusions in the *Nihongi* and *Man'yōshū*." In several places in his main text he wrote, "We find . . . in the *Nihongi*, but this is not correct," and "We find . . . in the *Man'yōshū*, but this is not correct." Furthermore, he pointed out a few errors even in the *Kojiki*, despite regarding it as the most reliable of the three (noting, for example, that "In

the section on Emperor Ōjin, the *hi* in *mahi* 'the sun' is written with 肥, but this is not

correct." [Modern scholars interpret this *mahi* as 'raging fire', for which 肥 is correct.])

Ishizuka had nothing to say about how these mistaken examples should be explained. Perhaps he thought that a few exceptions among hundreds of examples were not enough to worry about, but if we consider the exceptions as relevant to questions of *man'yōgana*

usage in the ancient texts and try to relate them to the Nara period phonological system, we cannot just set aside even a single exception. This deficiency in Ishizuka's work must be acknowledged.

Nonetheless, Ishizuka's research was consistently faithful to the facts. He never hid the facts or distorted them to suit his own ideas, and he therefore deserves our utmost respect. There is no getting around genuine exceptions, but among the examples that he cited as exceptions in his book, more than a few were unwitting factual errors caused by the shortcomings of his research. One shortcoming was insufficient comparison of the versions of the texts he used as sources, and as a result, many of the exceptions he cited were actually scribal errors. For example, he wrote that the *ke* in *sakeru* 'bloomed' and *nagakemu* 'probably long' could be written with 祁, 家, etc., but not with 氣, etc. In the *Man'yōshū* we find *sakeru* in book 17, part 34, and *nagakemu* in book 17, part 42, both with 氣 for *ke*, and neither is consistent with other examples. In other manuscript versions (including the Genryaku manuscript, the Nishi-honganji manuscript, and the Ōya manuscript), however, both *sakeru* and *nagakemu* are written with 家 for *ke* and are thus not exceptions. Ishizuka cited *yo* 'night' and *isayohu* 'to hesitate' as errors in the *Man'yōshū*, because in book 7, part 3, they appear with 與 for *yo*, even though both are words in which *yo* could be written with 欲, etc., but not with 與, etc. But in old typeset texts and in the Ōya manuscript, these instances have 夜 [in the same subset as 欲, 用, etc.] for *yo*, in conformity with other examples.

A second shortcoming of Ishizuka's research was caused by his imperfect understanding of the grammar of the language, which led him to conflate forms that must be distinguished. As a result, he often categorized correct usages as errors. For example, in the *Man'yōshū* we find imperative forms such as *ihahe* 'bless', with 敝 for *he* (book 19, section 35; book 15, section 38), and *sinube* 'recall', with 敝 for *be* (book 15, section 36). Ishizuka cited these examples as errors, but he noted in his own work that for verbs in this conjugation class, different *man'yōgana* subsets are used for *he/be* in the realis form than for *he/be* in the imperative form. The characters used for *he* in the realis form are those in the subset that includes 閉, while those used for *he* in the imperative form are in the subset that includes 敝. Thus, the examples just cited are correct. In his book, however, Ishizuka confused these imperative forms with the realis forms in example such as *tatakahe-ba* 'when one fights' and *tohe-do* 'though one asks', both of which have 閉 for *he*.

These are, of course, weak points, but when Ishizuka was writing, research on the *Nihongi*, *Man'yōshū*, and other texts had not yet progressed very far, and knowledge of grammar was inadequate, so some of the faults in his work can be forgiven. Nonetheless, by finding more exceptions than really exist, he came to expect exceptions, which led to a serious mistake. This is what is most unfortunate about his work. The mistake was to use eastern dialect words in the *Man'yōshū* as examples. According to Ishizuka himself, the *man'yōgana* distinctions within the 18 groups with subsets were adhered to in the central region of Japan and probably in regions farther west, but not in the eastern provinces.

This is why there are so many instances in which the distinctions are confused in the eastern poems in book 14 and especially in the border-guard poems of book 20. Taking examples from these poems is a very serious weakness. If Ishizuka had excluded eastern dialect words, the number of exceptions would have decreased dramatically.

This is not the only weak point of Ishizuka's book; there are quite a few other errors as well. For instance, he recognized two subsets of *man'yōgana* corresponding to modern *ke* but did not distinguish two subsets corresponding to modern *ge*; he put 己, 旣, and 忌 in the same subset as 伎 [corresponding to modern *ki*]; and he put 珮 in the same subset as 敝 [corresponding to modern *he*]. As for errors in the words he cited, he included the *he* of the irrealis form *ihe* of the verb *ifu* 'to say' in the 敝 subset, and he put the verb meaning 'to come' under the label *ke* as *keru* and treated *kinite* ['having come'] as *kenite*. Another shortcoming in Ishizuka's book is that his *man'yōgana* chart lists only characters that represented a single syllable with a sound value derived from Chinese. He did not include characters with a sound value derived from a native Japanese word, some of which had two syllables (e.g., using 竹 [which was used to write native Japanese *take~dake* 'bamboo'], for *dake* in *sudakedo* ['though gathering'], and using 當 [which was used to write native Japanese *ataru* 'to strike'], for *tagi* in *tagitu* ['to flow wildly into'; because of the semantic association]). (As is clear from his introduction and from statements in his main text, however, he did investigate these usages.)

What is most unfortunate is that Ishizuka was not meticulous about citing exceptions. Consequently, in order to make up for the deficiencies and correct the errors in his book, it is necessary to follow the same process he followed and redo the investigation from the start. There is no denying that this is a terrible inconvenience for us later scholars.

Nonetheless, despite these shortcomings of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, Ishizuka's discovery of the 18 groups of *man'yōgana* distinctions resulted from his careful scrutiny of examples in Nara period texts, and it rests on a solid foundation. We must therefore acknowledge that his results are for the most part reliable. As for what the basis was for these orthographic distinctions, Ishizuka said in his introduction that "It seems undeniable that, in the Nara period, the same sound had to be written with different *man'yōgana* depending on the word." Thus, he appears to have thought that the distinctions had nothing to do with sound and were just spelling rules, but immediately following the passage just quoted, he wrote, "There may have been some reason for the distinctions," which suggests that he did not have had a definite opinion on the matter. The passage quoted in *Kogen betsuonshō* [1849; by Kusakado Nobutaka (1818–1869)], however, reads, "In some instances, syllables which have the same pronunciation in the language today had different pronunciations in the ancient language, and the *man'yōgana* in ancient texts strictly distinguished them." It appears from this passage that Ishizuka took the orthographic distinctions to have been based on phonological distinctions.

Thus, the interpretation of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* differs depending on the book one consults, and we cannot tell which reflects Ishizuka's real intent, but my opinion is that the interpretation in *Kogen betsuonshō* was probably arrived at later. In any case, even if Ishizuka did actually realize that the orthographic distinctions were based on phonological distinctions, he had nothing to say about what sort of sound each character subset represented. My own research on this question has not yet gained general acceptance, but as is clear when we compare *Kogen e'enben* and Ōya Tōru's research, there is little doubt that the two *man'yōgana* subsets corresponding to modern *e* represented a phonological distinction between *e* and *ye* in the Nara period and earlier. If so, there were more phonological distinctions than previously believed in the Japanese of the Nara period and earlier, and conventional views of the Nara period phonological system require major revision. Moreover, conventional ideas about etymologies, meanings, textual interpretations, and inflectional forms must be reinvestigated in this new light, and these new findings also cannot be ignored in dating and correcting old texts.

Although Ishizuka's discovery has to do with facts about the Japanese language, its influence will be felt not only in Japanese language studies but in every field in which Nara period texts are used as research materials. The impact will clearly be enormous. We must not, however, be so dazzled by this great discovery that we overlook the other side of Ishizuka's achievement. That is, for the *man'yōgana* in groups other than the 18 groups with subsets, he showed clearly that the characters in each group were interchangeable, with no distinctions in usage.

When we examine the *man'yōgana* usage in old Japanese texts, we see that the same sound was not always represented by the same symbol; instead, a variety of different symbols were used for the same sound. (This is true for *katakana* and *hiragana* as well, but it is particularly evident in *man'yōgana*.) Thus, although many different letters are read identically today, in order to say with certainty whether or not different letters represented the same sound in ancient times as well, we must examine how each letter was used and ascertain whether it could be used interchangeably with other letters. If we were to jump to the conclusion that different letters represented the same sound in ancient times because they represent the same sound today, we would be unable to differentiate the *man'yōgana* sets 以 *i*, 伊 *i*, 異 *i*, 移 *i*, etc. [written with *hiragana* い *i*] and 爲 *wi*, 委 *wi*, 位 *wi*, 威 *wi*, etc. [written with *hiragana* ゐ *wi* but now pronounced *i*]. We know there was a distinction between these two groups in ancient times because when we examine how each character was used in ancient texts, it is clear that those in the 以伊 group were not distinguished from each other and could be used interchangeably, and the same was true of those in the 爲委 group, but there was a sharp distinction between the two groups, and they were not confused with each other. Thus, in an investigation of *kana* usage, every letter must be investigated, regardless of whether or not there are doubts about how it was used. In earlier scholarship, investigators went no farther than the small number of letters about which there were doubts, such as いえお [*i e o*] vs. ゐゑを [*wi we wo*, which

represent *i e o* today], between じず [*zi zu*] vs. ぢづ [*di du*, which represent *zi zu* today], and わ [*wa*] vs. non-word-initial は [*ha*, which represents *wa* today]. Ishizuka was the first researcher to investigate the use of all *man'yōgana*, and as a result, he not only discovered the distinctions between subsets in the 18 groups listed above, he also demonstrated that the *man'yōgana* in the groups without subsets were not distinguished and could be used interchangeably. It is not entirely clear how thoroughly Ishizuka investigated these groups without subsets, but he stated definitely in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* that "there are no usage rules," and when we see the detail in which he described the spelling restrictions involving these groups for certain particular words, it seems likely that he investigated them very thoroughly. Accordingly, even if what he said about these groups was unremarkable and no different from what previous scholars had thought, no one else had demonstrated that these ideas held true in reality, and there is no denying that his work on this aspect of orthography was also a great achievement.

In short, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* was a ground-breaking study of *man'yōgana* usage, and we must acknowledge that research on the phonological system of ancient Japanese rests on this firm foundation.

5   The Place of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* in the History of *Kana* Orthography Research

When we consider the place that *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* occupies in the history of *kana* orthography research, we must first look at how research on *kana* orthography has developed.

It is not certain when the notion of *kana* orthography first arose in Japan, but there were already books that explained *kana* orthography by early in the Kamakura period [1185–1333], so it must have arisen no later than the beginning of the Kamakura period and probably by the late Heian period. As for why the notion arose, previous research has attributed it to the fact that, beginning in the mid-Heian period, phonological changes in Japanese resulted in the mergers of い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], and お [*o*] and を [*wo*]. As far as we can tell, this explanation is not erroneous, but it overlooks another important factor, namely, the fact even though the two letters in each pair represented the same sound, people at that time thought of them as distinct letters. When we look at *kana* usage in the texts of that time, we see that the same sound was not always written with the same *kana*. Instead, various different letters were possible for a single sound. Thus, both い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*] represented the sound "i," both え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*] represented the sound "e," and so on because the earlier distinctions in pronunciation had been lost, but there is no difference between this situation and the fact that the sound "ka" could be represented not only by か [*ka*] but also by 𛀙 or 𛀚 [alternative *hiragana* (*hentaigana*) that dropped out of use after the set of *hiragana* letters was standardized in 1900], the sound "ki" could be represented not only by き [*ki*] but also by 𛀞, and so on. However, people did not make an issue of the distinctions between か [*ka*] and 𛀙𛀚, between き [*ki*] and 𛀞, etc.,

but they did make an issue of the distinctions between い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], between え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], between お [*o*] and を [*wo*], etc. The reason is that people considered か [*ka*] and ⬚, き [*ki*] and ⬚, etc., to be different forms of the same letter, whereas they thought of い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], etc., as different letters. If people had not thought of the *kana* in each of the latter pairs as different letters, doubts about how to choose correctly between them could not have arisen. We know that people thought of them as different letters because they appear separately in the *I-ro-ha* poem, which became popular at that time [and in which each *kana* letter appears once]. Syllables that were no longer distinct phonologically were written differently, that is, there were cases in which two or more *kana* represented the same sound, and this is why doubts about which *kana* to use first arose. In short, this was the origin of *kana* orthography. Thus, we can regard the changes in the phonological system that began in the mid-Heian period and the *I-ro-ha* poem, which appeared in the late Heian period, as the root causes of the notion of *kana* orthography.

Among books on *kana* orthography, *Gekanshū* [by Fujiwara no Teika (1162–1241)] is the oldest of those that can be dated. A notation in a Bun'ei era [1264–1275] manuscript shows that it had already been completed by the mid-Kamakura period. A section of this book entitled "confusing letter problems" concerns *kana* orthography, and although it is very elementary, what is known as Teika's *kana* orthography seems to be a revised version of it presented in *Kanamojizukai* [late 14th c.; by Gyōa (dates uncertain)]. Teika's *kana* orthography is said to be based on the tones of syllables, but since it actually appears to be based on examples in old manuscripts of *Gekanshū*, it is in fact a kind of historical *kana* orthography. Thus, while most of the examples cited in *Gekanshū* actually occur in ancient texts, it appears that most of the sources for these examples were late Heian period copies. Since spelling confusions had already arisen by that time, *kana* usage was not fixed in some cases. As a result, some alternative spellings occur in *Gekanshū* and *Kanamojizukai*, which means that they lack consistency if their *kana* orthography is regarded as a standard. Nonetheless, we can take them as evidence for the actual state of *kana* orthography at the time.

In the late Kamakura period and early Muromachi period, after Gyōa had revised the *kana* orthography in sources such as *Gekanshū* and compiled his *Kanamojizukai*, and before Keichū's work appeared, the books written about *kana* orthography almost all expounded what was presented in *Kanamojizukai*. Some of these books sowed the seeds for later research on inflection and grammatical particles, but there was an almost total lack of research on *kana* orthography, especially of research elucidating *kana* orthography in ancient texts. The one item worthy of note is in an epilogue to the *Man'yōshū* written in the early Muromachi period by Jōshun [dates uncertain], in which he explained that the *kana* orthography in the *Man'yōshū* does not match Teika's *kana* orthography.

Keichū's investigation of *kana* orthography in ancient texts led to his discovery that, in the early Heian period and before, the distinctions between い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], between

え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], between お [*o*] and を [*wo*], etc., were strictly maintained, with no confusion. He therefore used examples from that time to decide on the norms for *kana* orthography, which made it possible for him to make the previously vague *kana* orthography standards clear. This novel achievement was important and unprecedented, but when we look at Keichū's other works, they are all essentially the same as *Kanamojizukai*. Even in the rare instances of topics not treated in *Kanamojizukai*, we find all of them in works that predate Keichū's; nothing that Keichū wrote was new. He himself said that he was correcting mistakes in Teika's *kana* orthography and in *Kanamojizukai* and later works; he simply provided novel solutions to these problems. In works such as *Kogentei* [1764; by Katori Nabiko (1723–1782)] and *Wakakatsura* [by Murata Harumi (1746–1811)], classical scholars who followed Keichū supplemented his research in *Waji shōranshō* and made it more precise, but all these later works are derivative, based on *Waji shōranshō*. The distinction in ancient texts between *e* and *ye*, which Keichū had not noticed, is reported in *Kogen e'enben*, another work that continued and expanded on the research presented in *Waji shōranshō*. In the *I-ro-ha* poem and in the [now standard] *a-i-u-e-o kana* chart, い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], お [*o*] and を [*wo*], etc., are treated as different letters, and once *Waji shōranshō* and later works made it clear that these distinctions existed in ancient texts, it was possible for the author of *Kogen e'enben* to investigate whether or not there were also distinctions in the ancient texts between *e* and *ye*, between *i* and *yi*, and between *u* and *wu*. Thus, all the work mentioned in this paragraph belongs to the same strand of research, and it progressed gradually, beginning with the earliest work on *kana* orthography in Japan, each scholar taking from predecessors and giving to successors.

    The research Ishizuka reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* took the explanation in *Kojikiden* as its starting point, and that explanation was the outcome of Motoori's careful observations of *man'yōgana* usage in the *Kojiki*. The sole source for the explanation was Motoori's ingenuity. We must acknowledge, however, that his discovery of the *man'yōgana* rules in the *Kojiki* was aided by a fortunate state of affairs, namely, the fact that *man'yōgana* usage in the *Kojiki* followed the same-sound-same-letter principle. In order to transmit the ancient language without error and avoid ambiguity, the compiler of the *Kojiki* [Ō no Yasumaro (?–723)] avoided using two or more different characters for the same sound and used a single character as far as possible. He was unable to enforce this principle fully because customary spellings for the names of people and places were adopted without change, but his intent is clearly evident. Had he strictly followed this principle, the same word would always have been written the same way, but in fact for some sounds there were two or three or even as many as six different characters. There are also transcription errors in the copies made in later centuries, so it is not the case that the same sound is always represented with the same character, but because same-sound-same-letter principle was by and large applied, careful observation shows that any particular word is always written the same way. What Motoori pointed out in *Kojikiden*

were examples of this kind, and he was able to find them because of his talent for keen observation, but if a single sound had been represented by any of several different characters in the *Kojiki*, as in the *Nihongi* and *Man'yōshū*, even Motoori might very well not have discovered what he did. It was the same-sound-same-letter principle that allowed him to discover the *man'yōgana* rules in the *Kojiki*. Ō no Yasumaro's attention to detail brought light to Motoori's sharp eyes a thousand years later.

We cannot, of course, characterize the *man'yōgana* choices made in writing the *Kojiki* as research on *kana* orthography. The line of research that led to *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* began with Motoori's work and cannot be traced back any further. In other words, this innovative work sprouted with Motoori and bore fruit with Ishizuka; it was new direction, a break from the tradition that led from the earliest studies to works such as *Waji shōranshō* and *Kogen e'enben*. Considering when they began, it is appropriate to label the two lines of research the old line and the new line.

The old and new lines of *kana* orthography research differed in the way they developed. One difference was that the old line, right from the start, arose in response to problems of *kana* orthography. Its point of departure was uncertainty about how *kana* that represented the same sound should be differentiated in writing, and it led to a variety of research. The new line, on the other hand, was at first not concerned with differentiating *kana* that represented the same sound but simply with the rules for spelling particular words. As the research progressed, it became clear that the rules reflected distinctions that applied not just to particular words but to all uses of the *man'yōgana* corresponding to certain modern sounds. Only then did the rules discovered in the new line of research become problems of *kana* orthography.

A second difference between the two lines is that, in the old line, the goal of studying the *kana* usage in ancient texts was to establish norms for contemporary *kana* orthography, not to elucidate the ancient texts themselves. In other words, the reason for studying the *kana* in ancient texts was to help resolve a practical problem, and works with this goal began to appear. As noted above, the *kana* orthography of *Gekanshū* seems to follow the actual examples in old manuscripts, but the purpose of investigating the *kana* usage in these manuscripts was to use the examples as models when writing in *kana*. Keichū's *kana* research also appears to have had the same goal, and it is only when we reach works such as *Kogen e'enben* that understanding the *kana* orthography of ancient times became the goal. In short, the old line of research began with a practical problem and later turned to the study of the actual situation in ancient texts. The new line, on the other hand, began with the study of *man'yōgana* usage in the *Kojiki* and eventually moved on to *man'yōgana* usage in Nara period texts overall. Its goal from the start was to ascertain the *kana* orthography in these texts. If there was any other goal, it was just to provide criteria for interpreting the ancient language (and this too was for the purpose of elucidating the texts). Ishizuka explained the distinctive usage of the Nara period as norms for writing in *man'yōgana*, but this was a natural result of his discovery of this

distinctive usage, and there is no reason to think that he began his research with this goal in mind. Thus, in the old line of research, the reason for studying the *kana* orthography in ancient texts was to establish *kana* spelling norms. In the new line of research, new norms for *kana* orthography were a natural outgrowth of studying the *kana* usage in ancient texts.

There is another difference between the old and new lines of research that is even more notable than those pointed out above. Works in the old line never took up new topics, even when the results they obtained were new. Although *Waji shōranshō* was the first work to show that there were distinctions in the ancient texts between い [*i*] and ゐ [*wi*], between え [*e*] and ゑ [*we*], between お [*o*] and を [*wo*], etc., the two members of each of these pairs had already been treated separately in the *I-ro-ha* poem, and distinguishing them correctly had been a matter of concern ever since the notion of *kana* orthography first arose. The distinctions between じ [*zi*] and ぢ [*di*] and between ず [*zu*] and づ [*du*] are not treated in *Kanamojizukai*, and *Waji shōranshō* was not the first work to take them up, since they are discussed in earlier works. Research on the distinctions between *i* and *yi*, between *u* and *wu*, and *e* and *ye* appears in *Kogen e'enben*, which demonstrated that *e* and *ye* were in fact distinguished in usage, and earlier scholars had discussed this question. Thus, since research in the old line investigated the facts in ancient texts to address questions that had been raised previously, the results achieved were not really new and did not involve particularly novel ideas. In contrast, the research reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* was in the new line. Its initial goal was to investigate the *man'yōgana* spelling rules in the ancient texts, and it eventually led to the discovery of the 18 groups with subsets. This feature of *man'yōgana* usage was something that no one had previously suspected, and it was not just a new factual matter but also a completely new idea. The *kana* distinctions that were verified in *Waji shōranshō* and *Kogen e'enben* had also been incorporated into the *I-ro-ha* poem, into *Ametsuchi no uta* [an early Heian period calligraphy practice poem], and into the *a-i-u-e-o kana* chart, and since they had already become an issue, they readily attracted attention and were easy to investigate. The distinctions demonstrated in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, on the other hand, did not correspond to any distinctions in pronunciation or in writing that were incorporated into *a-i-u-e-o kana* chart, etc. These were new facts of which researchers were not yet aware, and because they were not easily noticed, the motivation for investigating them was not readily apparent. What did arouse attention was simply that the distinctions were evident here and there in certain special cases. Motoori found the spelling rules in the *Kojiki* because he discerned that particular spellings appeared for particular words, and this was the first step toward Ishizuka's new discovery. It is virtually impossible to begin doing research with no particular question and no particular goal in mind. If Motoori had not done his research, Ishizuka would never have done his, and the new discovery about *man'yōgana* orthography probably would not have been made. In this sense, there is no denying that Motoori's work played a vital role in the historical development of the new line of *kana* orthography research.

Thus, the old line of research began with an existing idea that led to the investigation of the actual facts, whereas the new line of research began with the study of the actual facts, and as that study progressed, discovered unexpected new facts. This difference between the old and new lines also gave rise to another major difference. Research in the old line was limited to certain subsets of *kana* (い [*i*] vs. ゐ [*wi*], え [*e*] vs. ゑ [*we*], お [*o*] vs. を [*wo*]; わ [*wa*] vs. non-word-initial は [*ha*]; じ [*zi*] vs. ぢ [*di*], ず [*zu*] and づ [*du*]; え for earlier *e* vs. え for earlier *ye*, etc.) and did not go beyond these, but research in the new line was extended to all *kana*. The old line arose as an attempt to resolve well-known problems, that is, *kana* that represented the same pronunciation but were treated separately in the *I-ro-ha* poem and the *a-i-u-e-o kana* chart; other *kana* were completely ignored. The new line, however, began with the study of actual *kana* spelling conventions, and because it was not possible to foresee to which *kana* these conventions would apply, all *kana* had to be investigated. As a result, research in the new line discovered the 18 *man'yōgana* groups with subsets and also confirmed that *man'yōgana* in each of the other groups corresponding to a single modern sound were used interchangeably. The great value of research that covers all *kana* is clear from what has already been said above.

As explained above, the new line of *kana* orthography research differs in several respects from the old line, and it has produced superior results. To appreciate the place of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* in the history of *kana* orthography research, we can contrast it with works in the old line.

Kanazukai oku no yamamichi was the first work in the new line to discover the distinctive characteristics of *kana* usage in ancient texts and develop a new account of *kana* orthography. The only works in the old line that are comparable in this respect are *Waji shōranshō* and *Kogen e'enben*. The latter treated the *man'yōgana* corresponding to *i*, *u*, and *e*, and demonstrated that there were two distinct subsets in the case of *e*. This matches the parts of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* that dealt with *i*, *u*, and *e*. *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, however, merely showed that the two subsets for *e* were distinguished in actual examples in Nara period texts and did not offer any explanation as to the basis for the distinction. *Kogen e'enben* showed that this distinction existed not only in the Nara period but also in the early Heian period and then went on to demonstrate that it was a distinction between *e* and *ye*. In other words, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* simply discovered the facts and did not attempt an explanation for those facts, whereas *Kogen e'enben* investigated the facts more closely and also provided an explanation. In this respect, the research in *Kogen e'enben* was more complete and more advanced than the research in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, but for the most part, particularly with respect to the investigation of the facts, it is the same as *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, and *Kogen e'enben* was written about 30 years later. For this reason, the research reported in *Kogen e'enben* can be regarded as just a revised and expanded version of one part of the research reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. In other words, most of what is in *Kogen e'enben* had already been achieved in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. Moreover, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* was not limited to the

man'yōgana corresponding to just two or three modern sounds; it had a much wider scope than *Kogen e'enben* and is in a completely different class in terms of its significance. Thus, the only work in the old line of research comparable to *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* is *Waji shōranshō*.

Waji shōranshō was the first work in the old line to develop a *kana* orthography based on the actual facts of ancient texts, and this is a point in common with *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. When we compare these two works and evaluate them today, *Waji shōranshō* was limited in scope to only some *kana*, whereas *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* dealt with all *kana*. In addition, *Waji shōranshō* merely confirmed the existence of the distinctions that had previously been recognized as problematic, whereas *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* demonstrated that there were distinctions in the ancient texts that had previously been completely unknown. *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* therefore surpassed *Waji shōranshō* both in comprehensiveness and in originality. Nonetheless, the results of Keichū's *kana* research were significant, and his inductive, scientific methodology had an enormous influence that transformed the approach of later scholars. Ishizuka had no such impact; his research simply followed in the footsteps of Keichū and Motoori. On the other hand, Keichū himself applied this methodology only to those few cases in which symbols that were considered different *kana* represented the same contemporary sound. It was in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* that the methodology was first extended to all *kana*. Thus, in research on *kana* orthography, it was only when the methodology pioneered by Keichū was adopted by Ishizuka that it reached its full potential. To be sure, *Waji shōranshō* and other works in the same line were not confined to simply investigating the facts; they went on to offer interpretations and even ventured into phonology. *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* made a great contribution by elucidating the facts, but for the most part it left open the interpretation of those facts. There was, however, a huge difference in terms of the difficulty of interpretation. Considering that the research in *Waji shōranshō* did not approach completeness until it had been revised and expanded by many later scholars, Ishizuka should not be faulted.

To sum up, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* and *Waji shōranshō* are the two jewels in the history of research on *kana* orthography in Japan, and scholars will long revere Ishizuka and Keichū equally.

6 6. Research after Kanazukai oku no yamamichi

Kogen betsuonshō (a one-volume manuscript), an elaboration on *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, was written by Kusakado Nobutaka (1818–1869), and there is a preface by Yagi Yoshiho [1800–1854] dated 1849. This book resembles *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* in format, consisting of explanatory notes, a chart of *man'yōgana*, and the main text. So as to be understandable to novices, it presents selections from the research reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. It omits all discussion of the *man'yōgana* groups for which there were no subsets and treats only the 18 groups with subsets. Only these 18 groups are

listed in its *man'yōgana* chart, and the chart has a modified format. The chart in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* divides the *man'yōgana* characters in each of these 18 groups first by source text (*Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, or *Man'yōshū*) and then subdivides by subset, whereas the chart in *Kogen betsuonshō* divides each group by subset and then notes for each character the source text(s) in which it appears, making it easy to tell apart the two subsets corresponding to each of the 18 modern sounds. The main text of *Kogen betsuonshō* also has a different format. All the example words cited in connection with the 18 groups are listed in *a-i-u-e-o* order, and the *man'yōgana* that were used for each word are noted. This revised format is ill-suited for showing that *man'yōgana* corresponding to the same modern sound were distinguished in use, but it is convenient for finding out which subset appears in a particular word when the reader already knows that there are subsets to consider. In the explanatory notes, Kusakado wrote, "As for あ [*a*], い [*i*], う [*u*], お [*o*], か/が [*ka/ga*], く/ぐ [*ku/gu*], さ/ざ [*sa/za*], し/じ [*si/zi*], す/ず [*su/zu*], せ/ぜ [*se/ze*], た/だ [*ta/da*], ち/ぢ [*ti/di*], つ/づ [*tu/du*], て/で [*te/de*], な [*na*], に [*ni*], ね [*ne*], の [*no*], は/ば [*ha/ha*], ふ/ぶ [*hu/bu*], ほ/ぼ [*ho/bo*], ま [*ma*], む [*mu*], も [*mo*], や [*ya*], ゆ [*yu*], ら [*ra*], り [*ri*], る [*ru*], れ [*re*], わ [*wa*], ゐ [*wi*], ゑ [*we*], and を [*wo*], any *man'yōgana* can be used in any word. But for え [*e*], き/ぎ [*ki/gi*], け/げ [*ke/ge*], こ/ご [*ko/go*], そ/ぞ [*so/zo*], と/ど [*to/do*], ぬ [*nu*], ひ/び [*hi/bi*], へ/べ [*he/be*], み [*mi*], め [*me*], よ [*yo*], and ろ [*ro*], the *man'yōgana* are separated into two sets that cannot be interchanged." This wording is very simple, but it plainly conveys the essentials of the research reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. We find nothing comparably clear in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* itself.

    Kogen betsuonshō thus does an excellent job of providing a clear and concise explanation of the research results in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, but it has very little value as *kana* orthography research. The explanation it provides does not go beyond *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* but follows it exactly and even retains its errors. With respect to the basis for the usage distinctions in the 18 *man'yōgana* groups with subsets, *Kogen betsuonshō* asserts clearly that they reflected phonological differences, but this too is taken directly from *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. As for the nature of the sounds involved, the preface says:

> The distinctions treated in this book, such as that between the 延 subset and the 愛 subset
> [corresponding to modern *e*], suggest that the pronunciation of ancient Japanese included
> distinctions that existed in the Chinese pronunciations of the characters adopted as *man'yōgana*,
> involving vowel height, tones, etc.

This passage suggests a certain amount of research on the pronunciation of Sino-Japanese loanwords, but in terms of progress, it does not go beyond *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*.

    In displaying the examples from *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* in *a-i-u-e-o* order, *Kogen betsuonshō* took the same approach as *Kogentei*, in contrast to *Waji shōranshō*. *Kogentei*, however, did not just blindly follow the explanation in *Waji shōranshō*; it used new sources that Keichū had not looked at, such as *Shin-senjikyō* [ca. 900] and *Saibarafu* [late Heian period], to make up for the deficiencies of and correct the errors in *Waji shōranshō*. There is

nothing like this in *Kogen betsuonshō*, which is therefore not as valuable as *Kogentei*. *Kogen betsuonshō* is comparable to *Man'yōshū* appendices that put the *Waji shōranshō* entries in *i-ro-ha* order.

  Kogen betsuonshō is the only work that followed up on the research presented in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, and it is very unfortunate that the new line of research on *kana* orthography faded away without advancing any further. Thanks to *Kogentei* and other works, the research reported in *Waji shōranshō* was gradually revised and expanded and eventually became fully developed both in terms of its factual basis and in terms of its explanations. The disparity between the old and new lines is enormous. Not only was there no research that followed up on *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, there was virtually no correct understanding of its nature. Arakida Hisaoyu [1746–1804] assessed it as follows:

> A provincial by the name of Ishizuka Tatsumaro has recently written about *kana*. His ideas are not at all original but are based on those of Motoori Norinaga. Where they agree with Motoori they are correct, and where they disagree they are incorrect. He says that there were distinctions among all *kana* in ancient times, but this is an inaccurate notion. For example, he says that 紀 was used to write *ki* 'fort' but not to write the *ki* in *kaki* 'fence', but there are many examples of 紀 that do not have the meaning 'fort'. He had complete faith in Motoori's account and lacked the ability to see beyond it, and thus forced the past into that mold. Needless to say, it is the work of a fool. (*Waka-shi no kenkyū* [*Research on the History of Waka*], pp. 324–5, in a letter to Osono and Seko).

This assessment reflects a complete misunderstanding. More recently, in *Kokugogaku shomoku kaidai* [*Japanese Language Research Bibliographical Notes*], we find:

> Although this book is about *kana* orthography its purpose is a bit different from the usual. By gathering together the Chinese characters that are used phonographically to render Japanese words in the *Man'yōshū*, *Kojiki*, and *Nihongi*, it considers which characters are used for each sound and notes the customary uses of different characters for the same sound depending on the word. For example, in the *Kojiki*, 古 was always used for *ko* in words such as *ko* 'child', *ko-* 'small', *otoko* 'man', and *hiko* 'boy', but in the *Nihongi*, 古, 姑, 故, 固, 枯, etc., were used. And for the past-tense ending *ke* in the *Nihongi*, 祁, 鷄, 稽, 家, 啓, etc., were used, but not 氣, 開, 慨, 階, 戒, 凱, or 居, but in the *Kojiki* only 祁 was used. This account is based on *Kojikiden*, and it is verified by thoroughly searching the three ancient texts. Words are arranged in *a-i-u-e-o* order. (pp. 93–4).

It is difficult to see this as a correct interpretation of the content of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. According to Hoshina Kōichi [1872–1955], in his *Kokugogaku shōshi* [*Short History of Japanese Language Studies*; 1899]:

> In short, *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* lists words in *a-i-u-e-o* order and explains how *man'yōgana* were used to write them. For example, it explains that 蘇 and 曾 were sometimes used to write *so* and then shows examples. It also gives counts of the *man'yōgana* that were used in the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*, and this is extremely convenient for comparative research (pp. 360–1).

And in the same author's Kokugogaku-shi [History of Japanese Language Studies; 1907], we find:

> Ishizuka's three-volume *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* is in the historical *kana* orthography camp. In his view, the most accurate orthography is in the *Kojiki*, *Nihongi*, and *Man'yōshū*, and no other texts surpass these (p. 195).

Hoshina was not mistaken here, but he missed the main point. Hanaoka Yasumi [1902], in his *Kokugogaku kenkyūshi* [*History of Japanese Language Research*; 1902], dismissed *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* along with works such as *Gagen kanazukai* [Proper *Kana* Orthography; 1814] as "books which do merit consideration" (p. 58). Not even the title of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* appears in *Nihon bunpōshi* [History of Japanese Grammar; a later edition of which appeared in 1934] by Fukui Kyūzō [1867–1951] or in *Nihongogaku-shi* [History of Japanese Language Studies; 1908] by Chō Tsuratsune [dates uncertain].

    Kanazukai oku no yamamichi is so little known, in part because it was never published (although it appears from a postscript in *Kogen seidakukō*, published in 1801, that were plans to publish it soon thereafter). Another likely reason is that there were very few manuscript copies. Also, the facts that Ishizuka uncovered were so novel that no one had never even imagined them, so it was probably hard for people to take him seriously. The most important reasons, however, were characteristics of the work itself. For one thing, the explanation in the introduction was woefully deficient and did not adequately convey a clear idea of the nature of the work. And in the main text, the spelling restrictions that applied to particular words are mixed together with the restrictions involving the 18 groups of *man'yōgana* that had subsets, making it difficult to tell them apart. In addition, labeling so many exceptions "incorrect" made it appear as if Ishizuka were stubbornly trying to set up rules even when there actually were no rules, which raised doubts about what the value of his results might be. Fortunately, *Kogen betsuonshō* came along to make up for these shortcomings by explaining the main points clearly and concisely, but this later work seems to have been disseminated even less widely than *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, and it appears to have had little actual influence. Under these circumstances, this important research on Nara period *man'yōgana* orthography remained unnoticed until now.

    I recognized the nature and great value of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* when I happened to discover that there was a distinction in Nara period texts between two subsets of *man'yōgana* corresponding to modern *ke*. While I was working on Nara period sentence structure several years ago, I began to have doubts about the use of 家 for *ke* in the eastern province poems in the *Man'yōshū*. When I investigated 家 and the other *man'yōgana* used for *ke*, I discovered that, except in the eastern province poems, there was a distinction between two subsets of *man'yōgana* corresponding to modern *ke*. The two subsets were used in different places and never confused with each other, and when I investigated other sources, it became clear that this distinction existed not just in the *Man'yōshū* but in all Nara period texts. Moreover, I surmised that there were probably similar distinctions for the *man'yōgana* corresponding to modern *ki*, *hi*, *mi*, *me*, *ko*, etc. I began with *ki*, and as my investigation proceeded, I happened to look at *Kogen betsuonshō*,

from which I learned that this kind of research had already been reported in *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*. When I started reading *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi*, I saw that the results reported there were essentially the same as what I had found, and it was then that I first realized its significance. Later, as I continued my own research, its shortcomings and errors became evident, but I confirmed that for the most part it was on the mark, and I became convinced of its tremendous value for research on *kana* orthography and on historical phonology.

My goal in writing this article has been to relate the gist of *Kanazukai oku no yamamichi* and convey the enormity of Ishizuka Tatsumaro's contribution to research on *kana* orthography. Consequently, I have not gone very deeply into the details of how *man'yōgana* were used in the Nara period. Since Ishizuka's work in this area also had many weaknesses, a thorough reexamination of these details is necessary. I am continuing my own independent investigation, which began with the *man'yōgana* corresponding to modern *ke* and *ki*, and I will not be able to say anything definite about many issues until this work is completed. I will therefore defer commenting on the details until that time.

Note from the Publication Committee

* In 1932 Prof. Hashimoto corrected this list of modern syllables corresponding to *man'yōgana* with two distinct subsets, replacing *nu* with *no*. Thus, there were two subsets corresponding to *no*, not to *nu*. Prof. Hashimoto also disavowed the claim that there were two subsets in the *Kojiki* corresponding to modern *ti*.